arXiv:1611.07185v1 [math.SP] 22 Nov 2016

# Sharp lower bounds on the spectral radius of uniform hypergraphs concerning degrees*

Lele Liu[1], Liying Kang[1], Erfang Shan[1,2] †

[1]Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, P.R. China

[2]School of Management, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, P.R. China

**Abstract**

Let $\mathcal{A}(H)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(H)$ be the adjacency tensor and signless Laplacian tensor of an $r$-uniform hypergraph $H$. Denote by $\rho(H)$ and $\rho(\mathcal{Q}(H))$ the spectral radii of $\mathcal{A}(H)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(H)$, respectively. In this paper, we present a lower bound on $\rho(H)$ in terms of vertex degrees and we characterize the extremal hypergraphs attaining the bound, which solves a problem posed by Nikiforov [V. Nikiforov, Analytic methods for uniform hypergraphs, Linear Algebra Appl. 457 (2014) 455-535]. Also, we prove a lower bound on $\rho(\mathcal{Q}(H))$ concerning degrees and give a characterization of the extremal hypergraphs attaining the bound.

**Keywords:** Uniform hypergraph; Adjacency tensor; Signless Laplacian tensor; Spectral radius

**AMS (2000) subject classification:** 15A42; 05C50; 05C70

## 1 Introduction

Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a simple undirected graph with $n$ vertices, and $A(G)$ be the adjacency matrix of $G$. Let $\rho(G)$ be the spectral radius of $G$, and $d_i$ be the degree of vertex $i$ of $G$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. In 1988, Hofmeister [6] obtained a lower bound on $\rho(G)$ in terms of degrees of vertices of $G$ as follows:

$$\rho(G) \geqslant \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{1}$$

*Research was partially supported by the National Nature Science Foundation of China (grant numbers 11471210, 11571222)

† *Corresponding authors. Email address: efshan@shu.edu.cn (E. Shan), lykang@i.shu.edu.cn (L. Kang), ahhylau@gmail.com (L. Liu)*

Furthermore, if $G$ is connected, then equality holds if and only if $G$ is either a regular graph or a semiregular bipartite graph (see details in [6] and [19]). The inequality (1) has many important applications in spectral graph theory (see [4, 8, 9]).

In recent years the research on spectra of hypergraphs via tensors have drawn increasingly extensive interest, accompanying with the rapid development of tensor spectral theory. A *hypergraph* $H = (V, E)$ consists of a (finite) set $V$ and a collection $E$ of non-empty subsets of $V$ (see [1]). The elements of $V$ are called *vertices* and the elements of $E$ are called *hyperedges*, or simply *edges* of the hypergraph. If there is a risk of confusion we will denote the vertex set and the edge set of a hypergraph $H$ explicitly by $V(H)$ and $E(H)$, respectively. An *$r$-uniform* hypergraph is a hypergraph in which every edge has size $r$. Throughout this paper, we denote by $V(H) = [n] := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ the vertex set of a hypergraph $H$. For a vertex $i \in V(H)$, the *degree* of $i$, denoted by $d_H(i)$ or simply by $d_i$, is the number of edges containing $i$. If each vertex of $H$ has the same degree, we say that the hypergraph $H$ is *regular*. For different $i$, $j \in V(H)$, $i$ and $j$ are said to be *adjacent*, written $i \sim j$, if there is an edge of $H$ containing both $i$ and $j$. A *walk* of hypergraph $H$ is defined to be an alternating sequence of vertices and edges $i_1e_1i_2e_2\cdots i_\ell e_\ell i_{\ell+1}$ satisfying that $\{i_j, i_{j+1}\} \subseteq e_j \in E(H)$ for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant \ell$. A walk is called a *path* if all vertices and edges in the walk are distinct. A hypergraph $H$ is called *connected* if for any vertices $i$, $j$, there is a walk connecting $i$ and $j$. For positive integers $r$ and $n$, a real *tensor* $\mathcal{A} = (a_{i_1i_2\cdots i_r})$ of order $r$ and dimension $n$ refers to a multidimensional array (also called *hypermatrix*) with entries $a_{i_1i_2\cdots i_r}$ such that $a_{i_1i_2\cdots i_r} \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $i_1$, $i_2$, …, $i_r \in [n]$. We say that tensor $\mathcal{A}$ is *symmetric* if its entries $a_{i_1i_2\cdots i_r}$ are invariant under any permutation of its indices.

Recently, Nikiforov [10] presented some analytic methods for studying uniform hypergraphs, and posed the following question (see [10, Question 11.5]):

**Question 1.1** ([10])**.** *Suppose that $H$ is an $r$-uniform hypergraph on $n$ vertices ($r \geqslant 3$). Let $d_i$ be the degree of vertex $i$, $i \in [n]$, and $\rho(H)$ be the spectral radius of $H$. Is it always true*

$$\rho(H) \geqslant \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^{\frac{r}{r-1}}\right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}} ?$$

In this paper, we focus on the above question, and give a solution to Question 1.1. Our main results can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Suppose that $H$ is an $r$-uniform hypergraph on $n$ vertices ($r \geqslant 3$). Let $d_i$ be the degree of vertex $i$ of $H$, and $\rho(H)$ be the spectral radius of $H$. Then*

$$\rho(H) \geqslant \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^{\frac{r}{r-1}}\right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}}.$$

*If $H$ is connected, then the equality holds if and only if $H$ is regular.*

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let $H$ be a connected $r$-uniform hypergraph on $n$ vertices ($r \geqslant 3$). Suppose that $d_i$, $i \in [n]$, is the degree of vertex $i$, and $\rho(\mathcal{Q}(H))$ is the spectral radius of the signless Laplacian tensor $\mathcal{Q}(H)$. Then*

$$\rho(\mathcal{Q}(H)) \geqslant 2\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^{\frac{r}{r-1}}\right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}},$$

*with equality if and only if $H$ is regular.*

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section we review some basic notations and necessary conclusions. Denote the set of nonnegative vectors (positive vectors) of dimension $n$ by $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ ($\mathbb{R}_{++}^n$). The unit tensor of order $r$ and dimension $n$ is the tensor $\mathcal{I}_n = (\delta_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_r})$, whose entry is 1 if $i_1 = i_2 = \cdots = i_r$ and 0 otherwise.

The following general product of tensors was defined by Shao [15], which is a generalization of the matrix case.

**Definition 2.1** ([15]). *Let $\mathcal{A}$ (and $\mathcal{B}$) be an order $r \geqslant 2$ (and order $k \geqslant 1$), dimension $n$ tensor. Define the product $\mathcal{AB}$ to be the following tensor $\mathcal{C}$ of order $(r-1)(k-1)+1$ and dimension $n$*

$$c_{i\alpha_1\cdots\alpha_{r-1}} = \sum_{i_2,\ldots,i_r=1}^{n} a_{ii_2\cdots i_r} b_{i_2\alpha_1}\cdots b_{i_r\alpha_{r-1}} \quad (i \in [n], \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{r-1} \in [n]^{k-1}).$$

From the above definition, let $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)^{\mathrm{T}}$ be a column vector of dimension $n$. Then $\mathcal{A}\boldsymbol{x}$ is a vector in $\mathbb{C}^n$, whose *i-th* component is as the following

$$(\mathcal{A}\boldsymbol{x})_i = \sum_{i_2,\ldots,i_r=1}^{n} a_{ii_2\cdots i_r} x_{i_2}\cdots x_{i_r}, \quad i \in [n]$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathcal{A}\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_r=1}^{n} a_{i_1 i_2\cdots i_r} x_{i_1} x_{i_2}\cdots x_{i_r}.$$

In 2005, Lim [7] and Qi [12] independently introduced the concepts of tensor eigenvalues and the spectra of tensors. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an order $r$ and dimension $n$ tensor, $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, x_2 \ldots, x_n)^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be a column vector of dimension $n$. If there exists a number $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and a nonzero vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}\boldsymbol{x} = \lambda \boldsymbol{x}^{[r-1]},$$

then $\lambda$ is called an *eigenvalue* of $\mathcal{A}$, $\boldsymbol{x}$ is called an *eigenvector* of $\mathcal{A}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda$, where $\boldsymbol{x}^{[r-1]} = (x_1^{r-1}, x_2^{r-1}, \ldots, x_n^{r-1})^{\mathrm{T}}$. The *spectral radius* $\rho(\mathcal{A})$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is the

maximum modulus of the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}$. It was proved that $\lambda$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if it is a root of the characteristic polynomial of $\mathcal{A}$ (see details in [16]).

In 2012, Cooper and Dutle [3] defined the adjacency tensors for $r$-uniform hypergraphs.

**Definition 2.2** ([3, 14]). *Let $H = (V(H), E(H))$ be an $r$-uniform hypergraph on $n$ vertices. The adjacency tensor of $H$ is defined as the order $r$ and dimension $n$ tensor $\mathcal{A}(H) = (a_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_r})$, whose $(i_1 i_2 \cdots i_r)$-entry is*

$$a_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_r} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(r-1)!}, & \text{if } \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_r\} \in E(H), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Let $\mathcal{D}(H)$ be an order $r$ and dimension $n$ diagonal tensor with its diagonal element $d_{ii\cdots i}$ being $d_i$, the degree of vertex $i$, for all $i \in [n]$. Then $\mathcal{L}(H) = \mathcal{D}(H) - \mathcal{A}(H)$ is the Laplacian tensor of $H$, and $\mathcal{Q}(H) = \mathcal{D}(H) + \mathcal{A}(H)$ is the signless Laplacian tensor of $H$.*

For an $r$-uniform hypergraph $H$, denote the spectral radius of $\mathcal{A}(H)$ by $\rho(H)$. It should be announced that spectral radius defined in [10] differ from this paper, while for an $r$-uniform hypergraph $H$ the spectral radius defined in [10] equals to $(r-1)!\rho(H)$. This is not essential and does not effect the result.

In [5], the weak irreducibility of nonnegative tensors was defined. It was proved that an $r$-uniform hypergraph $H$ is connected if and only if its adjacency tensor $\mathcal{A}(H)$ is weakly irreducible (see [5] and [18]). Clearly, this shows that if $H$ is connected, then $\mathcal{A}(H)$, $\mathcal{L}(H)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(H)$ are all weakly irreducible. The following result for nonnegative tensors is stated as a part of Perron-Frobenius theorem in [2].

**Theorem 2.1** ([2]). *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a nonnegative tensor of order $r$ and dimension $n$. Then we have the following statements.*

(1) *$\rho(\mathcal{A})$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{A}$ with a nonnegative eigenvector corresponding to it.*

(2) *If $\mathcal{A}$ is weakly irreducible, then $\rho(\mathcal{A})$ is the unique eigenvalue of $\mathcal{A}$ with the unique eigenvector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n_{++}$, up to a positive scaling coefficient.*

**Theorem 2.2** ([13]). *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a nonnegative symmetric tensor of order $r$ and dimension $n$. Then we have*

$$\rho(\mathcal{A}) = \max\left\{\boldsymbol{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathcal{A}\boldsymbol{x}) \,|\, x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+, ||\boldsymbol{x}||_r = 1\right\}.$$

*Furthermore, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ with $||\boldsymbol{x}||_r = 1$ is an optimal solution of the above optimization problem if and only if it is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{A}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\rho(\mathcal{A})$.*

The following concept of *direct products* (also called *Kronecker product*) of tensors was defined in [15], which is a generalization of the direct products of matrices.

**Definition 2.3** ([15]). *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be two order $r$ tensors with dimension $n$ and $m$, respectively. Define the direct product $\mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{B}$ to be the following tensor of order $r$ and dimension $mn$ (the set of subscripts is taken as $[n]\times[m]$ in the lexicographic order):*

$$(\mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{B})_{(i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)\cdots(i_r,j_r)}=a_{i_1i_2\cdots i_r}b_{j_1j_2\cdots j_r}.$$

*In particular, if $\boldsymbol{x}=(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n)^{\mathrm{T}}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}=(y_1,y_2,\ldots,y_m)^{\mathrm{T}}$ are two column vectors with dimension $n$ and $m$, respectively. Then*

$$\boldsymbol{x}\otimes\boldsymbol{y}=(x_1y_1,\ldots,x_1y_m,x_2y_1,\ldots,x_2y_m,\ldots,x_ny_1,\ldots,x_ny_m)^{\mathrm{T}}.$$

The following basic results can be found in [15].

**Proposition 2.1** ([15]). *The following conclusions hold.*

(1) $(\mathcal{A}_1+\mathcal{A}_2)\otimes\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{A}_1\otimes\mathcal{B}+\mathcal{A}_2\otimes\mathcal{B}$.

(2) $(\lambda\mathcal{A})\otimes\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{A}\otimes(\lambda\mathcal{B})=\lambda(\mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{B})$, $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$.

(3) $(\mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{B})(\mathcal{C}\otimes\mathcal{D})=(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{C})\otimes(\mathcal{B}\mathcal{D})$.

**Theorem 2.3** ([15]). *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are two order $r$ tensors with dimension $n$ and $m$, respectively. Let $\lambda$ be an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{A}$ with corresponding eigenvector $\boldsymbol{u}$, and $\mu$ be an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{B}$ with corresponding eigenvector $\boldsymbol{v}$. Then $\lambda\mu$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{B}$ with corresponding eigenvector $\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{v}$.*

## 3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we shall give a proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1**. Let $H$ be an $r$-uniform hypergraph with spectral radius $\rho(H)$ and vertex set $V(H)=[n]$, and denote by $d_i$ the degree of vertex $i$ of $H$, $i=1,2,\ldots,n$.

We now define an $r$-uniform hypergraph $\widetilde{H}$ as follows. Hypergraph $\widetilde{H}$ has vertex set $V(H)\times[r]$, and $\{(i_1,j_1),(i_2,j_2),\ldots,(i_r,j_r)\}\in E(\widetilde{H})$ is an edge of $\widetilde{H}$ if and only if $\{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_r\}\in E(H)$ and $j_1,j_2,\ldots,j_r$ are distinct each other. Let $\mathcal{A}(H)=(a_{i_1i_2\cdots i_r})$ be the adjacency tensor of $H$. We define an order $r$ and dimension $r$ tensor $\mathcal{B}=(b_{j_1j_2\cdots j_r})$ as follows:

$$b_{j_1j_2\cdots j_r}=\begin{cases}1, & \text{if } j_1,j_2,\ldots,j_r \text{ are distinct each other,}\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}\tag{2}$$

We denote the adjacency tensor of $\widetilde{H}$ by $\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{H})$, in which the set of subscripts is taken as $[n]\times[r]$ in the lexicographic order.

**Claim 1.** If $H$ is connected, then $\widetilde{H}$ is connected.

**Proof of Claim 1.** It suffices to show that for any $(i,j)$, $(s,t) \in V(\widetilde{H})$, there exists a walk connecting them. We distinguish the following two cases.

**Case 1.** $i \neq s$, $j \neq t$.

Since $H$ is connected, there exists a path $i = i_1 e_1 i_2 \cdots i_\ell e_\ell i_{\ell+1} = s$. Since $r \geqslant 3$, there exist $j'$ such that $j' \neq j$, $j' \neq t$. From the definition of $\widetilde{H}$, if $\ell$ is odd, we have

$$\begin{cases} (i_h, j) \sim (i_{h+1}, j'), & h = 1, 3, \ldots, \ell - 2, \\ (i_k, j') \sim (i_{k+1}, j), & k = 2, 4, \ldots, \ell - 1, \\ (i_\ell, j) \sim (s, t). \end{cases}$$

If $\ell$ is even, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} (i_h, j) \sim (i_{h+1}, j'), & h = 1, 3, \ldots, \ell - 1, \\ (i_k, j') \sim (i_{k+1}, j), & k = 2, 4, \ldots, \ell - 2, \\ (i_\ell, j') \sim (s, t). \end{cases}$$

Hence there exists a walk connecting $(i,j)$ and $(s,t)$.

**Case 2.** $i = s$, $j \neq t$.

Since $r \geqslant 3$, there exist $i'$ and $j'$ such that $i' \neq i$, $j' \neq j$, $j' \neq t$. According to Case 1 we know that there is a path connecting $(i,j)$ and $(i',j')$. Noting that $i' \neq s$ and $j' \neq t$, there is a path connecting $(i',j')$ and $(s,t)$ by Case 1. So there exists a walk connecting $(i,j)$ and $(s,t)$, as desired. The proof of the claim is completed.

**Claim 2.** $\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{H}) = \mathcal{A}(H) \otimes \mathcal{B}$.

**Proof of Claim 2.** From the definition of $\widetilde{H}$, it follows that

$$(\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{H}))_{(i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)\cdots(i_r,j_r)} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(r-1)!}, & \text{if } \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_r\} \in E(H), b_{j_1 j_2 \cdots j_r} = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

According to Definition 2.3, $\mathcal{A}(H) \otimes \mathcal{B}$ is an order $r$ and dimension $rn$ tensor, whose entries are given by

$$(\mathcal{A}(H) \otimes \mathcal{B})_{(i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)\cdots(i_r,j_r)} = a_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_r} b_{j_1 j_2 \cdots j_r}.$$

If $\{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_r\} \in E(H)$ and $b_{j_1 j_2 \cdots j_r} = 1$, then

$$(\mathcal{A}(H) \otimes \mathcal{B})_{(i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)\cdots(i_r,j_r)} = \frac{1}{(r-1)!},$$

and 0 otherwise. Hence $\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{H}) = \mathcal{A}(H) \otimes \mathcal{B}$, as desired.

**Claim 3.** $\rho(\mathcal{B}) = (r-1)!$.

**Proof of Claim 3.** Let $\boldsymbol{e} = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^r$. It follows from Theorem 2.2 that

$$\rho(\mathcal{B}) \geqslant \frac{\boldsymbol{e}^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathcal{B}\boldsymbol{e})}{||\boldsymbol{e}||_r^r} = \frac{r!}{r} = (r-1)!.$$

On the other hand, let $\boldsymbol{z} = (z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_r) \in \mathbb{R}_+^r$ be a nonnegative eigenvector corresponding to $\rho(\mathcal{B})$ with $||\boldsymbol{z}||_r = 1$. By AM-GM inequality, we have

$$\rho(\mathcal{B}) = \boldsymbol{z}^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathcal{B}\boldsymbol{z}) = r! z_1 z_2 \cdots z_r \leqslant r! \left( \frac{z_1^r + z_2^r + \cdots + z_r^r}{r} \right) = (r-1)!,$$

with equality holds if and only if

$$z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_r = \frac{1}{\sqrt[r]{r}}.$$

Therefore, $\rho(\mathcal{B}) = (r-1)!$. The proof of the claim is completed.

**Claim 4.** $\rho(\widetilde{H}) = (r-1)!\rho(H)$.

**Proof of Claim 4.** By Claim 2, $\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{H}) = \mathcal{A}(H) \otimes \mathcal{B}$. We consider the following two cases depending on whether or not $H$ is connected.

**Case 1**. $H$ is connected.

Since $H$ is connected, we have $\mathcal{A}(H)$ is weakly irreducible. From Theorem 2.1, let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be the positive eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue $\rho(H)$. Then by Theorem 2.3, $\rho(H)\rho(\mathcal{B})$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{A}(H) \otimes \mathcal{B}$ with a positive eigenvector $\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}$. By Claim 1, $\widetilde{H}$ is connected. It follows from Theorem 2.1 and Claim 3 that $(r-1)!\rho(H)$ must be the spectral radius of $\mathcal{A}(H) \otimes \mathcal{B}$, i.e., $\rho(\widetilde{H}) = (r-1)!\rho(H)$.

**Case 2**. $H$ is disconnected.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{A}(H) + \varepsilon\mathcal{J}_1$, $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{B} + \varepsilon\mathcal{J}_2$, where $\mathcal{J}_1$ and $\mathcal{J}_2$ are order $r$ tensors with all entries 1 with dimension $n$ and $r$, respectively. Then $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$ are both positive tensors, and therefore are weakly irreducible. Using the similar arguments as Case 1, we have

$$\rho(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon \otimes \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon) = \rho(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon)\rho(\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon).$$

Notice that the maximal absolute value of the roots of a complex polynomial is a continuous function on the coefficients of the polynomial. Take the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ on both sides of the above equation, we obtain the desired result. The proof of the claim is completed.

It is clear that $\widetilde{H}$ is an $r$-partite hypergraph with partition

$$V(\widetilde{H}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{r} \left( V(H) \times \{i\} \right).$$

We define a vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{rn}$ as follows:

$$x_{(i,j)} = \begin{cases} \dfrac{a_i}{\sqrt[r]{rn}}, & \text{if } i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, \\ \dfrac{1}{\sqrt[r]{rn}}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where $a_1$, $a_2$, …, $a_n \geqslant 0$ and $a_1^r + a_2^r + \cdots + a_n^r = n$. It is obvious that $d_{\widetilde{H}}((i,j)) = (r-1)!d_i$ for any $i \in [n]$, $j \in [r]$. By Theorem 2.2, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\widetilde{H}) \geqslant \boldsymbol{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{H})\boldsymbol{x}) &= r \sum_{\{(i_1,j_1),\ldots,(i_r,j_r)\} \in E(\widetilde{H})} x_{(i_1,j_1)} x_{(i_2,j_2)} \cdots x_{(i_r,j_r)} \\ &= r \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{a_i}{\sqrt[r]{rn}} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt[r]{rn}} \right)^{r-1} \cdot (r-1)! d_i \right] \\ &= \frac{(r-1)!}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i d_i. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

It follows from $a_1^r + a_2^r + \cdots + a_n^r = n$ and Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i d_i &\leqslant \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \cdot \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^{\frac{r}{r-1}} \right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}} \\ &= \sqrt[r]{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^{\frac{r}{r-1}} \right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}} \end{aligned}$$

with equality if and only if

$$a_i = \frac{\sqrt[r]{n} d_i^{\frac{1}{r-1}}}{\sqrt[r]{\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^{\frac{r}{r-1}}}}, \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \tag{5}$$

Now we set $a_i$ as (5). In the light of (4) and (5) we have

$$\rho(H) = \frac{\rho(\widetilde{H})}{(r-1)!} \geqslant \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i d_i = \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^{\frac{r}{r-1}} \right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}}. \tag{6}$$

Now we give a characterization of extremal hypergraphs achieving the equality in (6). Suppose first the equality holds in (6). Then the vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{rn}$ defined by (3) is an eigenvector corresponding to $\rho(\widetilde{H})$ by Theorem 2.2. Note that $H$ is connected, by Theorem 2.1, we let $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n)^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ be a positive eigenvector corresponding to $\rho(H)$. From Theorem 2.3 and Claim 4, it follows that $\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}$ is a positive eigenvector to $\rho(\widetilde{H})$. By Claim 1 and Theorem 2.1, $\widetilde{H}$ is connected, and we see that $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}$ are linear dependence. Notice that

$$\boldsymbol{x} = \frac{1}{\sqrt[r]{rn}} (\underbrace{a_1, 1, \ldots, 1}_{r}, \underbrace{a_2, 1, \ldots, 1}_{r}, \ldots, \underbrace{a_n, 1, \ldots, 1}_{r})^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^{rn}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}=(\underbrace{u_1,u_1,\ldots,u_1}_{r},\underbrace{u_2,u_2,\ldots,u_2}_{r},\ldots,\underbrace{u_n,u_n,\ldots,u_n}_{r})^{\mathrm{T}}\in\mathbb{R}^{rn}_{++}.$$

Consequently, $u_1=u_2=\cdots=u_n$, which implies that $H$ is regular.

Conversely, if $H$ is a connected regular hypergraph, it is easy to see that the equality (6) holds. □

**Remark 3.1.** *It is known that the spectral radius $\rho(H)$ of $H$ is greater than or equal to the average degree [3], i.e.,*

$$\rho(H)\geqslant\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i}{n}.$$

*It follows from PM inequality that*

$$\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\frac{r}{r-1}}\right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\geqslant\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i}{n}.$$

*Therefore Theorem 1.1 has a better estimation for spectral radius of $H$.*

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we shall give a proof of Theorem 1.2.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Let $H$ be a connected $r$-uniform hypergraph with vertex set $V(H)=[n]$. Let $\widetilde{H}$ be the $r$-uniform hypergraph as defined in Theorem 1.1. Suppose that $\mathcal{B}$ is the order $r$ and dimension $r$ tensor given by (2), and $\mathcal{I}_r$ is the unit tensor of order $r$ and dimension $r$. We have the following claims.

**Claim 5.** $\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H})=(r-1)!(\mathcal{D}(H)\otimes\mathcal{I}_r)+\mathcal{A}(H)\otimes\mathcal{B}$.

**Proof of Claim 5.** Recall that $d_{\widetilde{H}}((i,j))=(r-1)!d_i$ for any $i\in[n]$, $j\in[r]$, we have

$$\mathcal{D}(\widetilde{H})_{(i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)\cdots(i_r,j_r)}=\begin{cases}(r-1)!d_i, & \text{if } i_1=\cdots=i_r=i, j_1=\cdots=j_r=j,\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

On the other hand, by Definition 2.3 we obtain that

$$[(r-1)!(\mathcal{D}(H)\otimes\mathcal{I}_r)]_{(i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)\cdots(i_r,j_r)}=(r-1)!\mathcal{D}(H)_{i_1i_2\cdots i_r}(\mathcal{I}_r)_{j_1j_2\cdots j_r}.$$

If $i_1=i_2=\cdots=i_r=i$, $i\in[n]$ and $j_1=j_2=\cdots=j_r=j$, then

$$[(r-1)!(\mathcal{D}(H)\otimes\mathcal{I}_r)]_{(i_1,j_1)(i_2,j_2)\cdots(i_r,j_r)}=(r-1)!d_i$$

and 0 otherwise. It follows that

$$\mathcal{D}(\widetilde{H}) = (r-1)!(\mathcal{D}(H) \otimes \mathcal{I}_r).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H}) = \mathcal{D}(\widetilde{H}) + \mathcal{A}(\widetilde{H}) = (r-1)!(\mathcal{D}(H) \otimes \mathcal{I}_r) + \mathcal{A}(H) \otimes \mathcal{B}.$$

The proof of the claim is completed.

**Claim 6.** $\rho(\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H})) = (r-1)!\rho(\mathcal{Q}(H))$.

**Proof of Claim 6.** Since $H$ is connected, $\mathcal{Q}(H)$ is weakly irreducible. From Theorem 2.1, we let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be the positive eigenvector to $\rho(\mathcal{Q}(H))$. Let $\boldsymbol{e} = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^r_{++}$. By Proposition 2.1, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H})(\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}) &= [(r-1)!(\mathcal{D}(H) \otimes \mathcal{I}_r) + \mathcal{A}(H) \otimes \mathcal{B}](\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}) \\
&= [(r-1)!(\mathcal{D}(H) \otimes \mathcal{I}_r)](\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}) + [\mathcal{A}(H) \otimes \mathcal{B}](\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}) \\
&= (r-1)!(\mathcal{D}(H)\boldsymbol{u}) \otimes (\mathcal{I}_r\boldsymbol{e}) + (\mathcal{A}(H)\boldsymbol{u}) \otimes (\mathcal{B}\boldsymbol{e}) \\
&= (r-1)!(\mathcal{D}(H)\boldsymbol{u}) \otimes \boldsymbol{e} + (r-1)![(\mathcal{A}(H)\boldsymbol{u}) \otimes \boldsymbol{e}] \\
&= (r-1)![\mathcal{D}(H)\boldsymbol{u} + \mathcal{A}(H)\boldsymbol{u}] \otimes \boldsymbol{e} \\
&= (r-1)!(\mathcal{Q}(H)\boldsymbol{u}) \otimes \boldsymbol{e}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from $\mathcal{Q}(H)\boldsymbol{u} = \rho(\mathcal{Q}(H))\boldsymbol{u}^{[r-1]}$ that

$$\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H})(\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}) = (r-1)!\rho(\mathcal{Q}(H))(\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{e})^{[r-1]},$$

which yields that $\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}$ is a positive eigenvector of $\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H})$ corresponding to $(r-1)!\rho(\mathcal{Q}(H))$. Note that $H$ is connected, then $\widetilde{H}$ is connected by Claim 1. Therefore $\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H})$ is weakly irreducible. By Theorem 2.1, $(r-1)!\rho(\mathcal{Q}(H))$ is the spectral radius of signless Laplacian tensor $\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H})$, as claimed.

Let $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{rn}$ be the column vector defined by (3). By Theorem 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H})) &\geqslant \boldsymbol{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H})\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathcal{D}(\widetilde{H})\boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{H})\boldsymbol{x}) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{r}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{D}(\widetilde{H})_{(i,j)(i,j)\cdots(i,j)} x_{(i,j)}^r + \boldsymbol{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{H})\boldsymbol{x}) \\
&= \frac{(r-1)!}{rn}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(a_i^r + r - 1)d_i + \boldsymbol{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{H})\boldsymbol{x}).
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Furthermore, by AM-GM inequality, we have

$$a_i^r + r - 1 = a_i^r + \underbrace{1 + 1 + \cdots + 1}_{r-1} \geqslant r a_i, \ i \in [n]. \tag{8}$$

So it follows from (4), (7) and (8) that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H})) &\geqslant \frac{(r-1)!}{rn}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(a_i^r+r-1)d_i+\frac{(r-1)!}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}a_id_i\\ &\geqslant \frac{2(r-1)!}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}a_id_i.\end{aligned}$$

By (5), we obtain

$$\rho(\mathcal{Q}(H))=\frac{\rho(\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H}))}{(r-1)!}\geqslant\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}a_id_i=2\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}d_i^{\frac{r}{r-1}}\right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}}. \tag{9}$$

Suppose that the equality holds in (9). Then the vector $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{rn}$ defined by (3) is an eigenvector corresponding to $\rho(\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H}))$ by Theorem 2.2 and $a_i=1$, $i\in[n]$ by (8). Recall that $\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H})$ is weakly irreducible. By Claim 6, $\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}$ is a positive eigenvector to $\rho(\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{H}))$. We see that $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}$ are linear dependence by Theorem 2.1. Therefore, $d_1=d_2=\cdots=d_n$, which implies that $H$ is regular.

Conversely, if $H$ is a regular connected hypergraph, it is straightforward to verify that the equality (9) holds. □

**Remark 4.1.** *Recently, Nikiforov introduces the concept of odd-colorable hypergraphs [11], which is a generalization of bipartite graphs. Let $r\geqslant 2$ and $r$ be even. An $r$-uniform hypergraph $H$ with $V(H)=[n]$ is called odd-colorable if there exists a map $\varphi:[n]\to[r]$ such that for any edge $\{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_r\}$ of $H$, we have*

$$\varphi(i_1)+\varphi(i_2)+\cdots+\varphi(i_r)\equiv\frac{r}{2}\,(\mathrm{mod}\,r).$$

*It was proved that if $H$ is a connected $r$-uniform hypergraph, then $\rho(\mathcal{L}(H))=\rho(\mathcal{Q}(H))$ if and only if $r$ is even and $H$ is odd-colorable [17]. Therefore we have*

$$\rho(\mathcal{L}(H))\geqslant 2\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}d_i^{\frac{r}{r-1}}\right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}}$$

*for a connected odd-colorable hypergraph $H$, which generalizes the result in [19].*

## References


[1] A. Bretto, Hypergraph Theory: An Introduction, Springer, 2013.

[2] K. C. Chang, K. Pearson, T. Zhang, Perron-Frobenius theorem for nonegative tensors, Commun. Math. Sci. 6 (2008) 507–520.

[3] J. Cooper, A. Dutle, Spectra of uniform hypergraphs, Linear Algebra Appl. 436 (2012) 3268–3299.

[4] M. Fiedler, V. Nikiforov, Spectral radius and Hamiltonicity of graphs, Linear Algebra Appl. 432 (2010) 2170–2173.

[5] S. Friedland, A. Gaubert, L. Han, Perron-Frobenius theorems for nonnegative multilinear forms and extensions, Linear Algebra Appl. 438 (2013) 738–749.

[6] M. Hofmeister, Spectral radius and degree sequence, Math. Nachr. 139 (1988) 37–44.

[7] L. H. Lim, Singular values and eigenvalues of tensors: a variational approach, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing, vol. 1, CAMSAP'05, 2005, pp. 129–132.

[8] V. Nikiforov, Eigenvalues and degree deviation in graphs, Linear Algebra Appl. 414 (2006) 347–360.

[9] V. Nikiforov, Bounds on graph eigenvalues II, Linear Algebra Appl. 427 (2007) 183–189.

[10] V. Nikiforov, Analytic methods for uniform hypergraphs, Linear Algebra Appl. 457 (2014) 455-535.

[11] V. Nikiforov, Hypergraphs and hypermatrices with symmetric spectrum, arXiv: 1605.00709v2, 2016.

[12] L. Qi, Eigenvalues of a real supersymmetric tensor, J. Symbolic Comput. 40 (2005) 1302–1324.

[13] L. Qi, Symmetric nonnegative tensors and copositive tensors, Linear Algebra Appl. 439 (2013) 228–238.

[14] L. Qi, $H^+$-eigenvalue of Laplacian and signless Laplacian tensors, Commun. Math. Sci. 12 (2014) 1045-1064.

[15] J. Shao, A general product of tensors with applications, Linear Algebra Appl. 439 (2013) 2350–2366.

[16] J. Shao, H. Shan, B. Wu, Some spectral properties and characterizations of connected odd-bipartite uniform hypergraphs, Linear Multilinear Algebra 63 (12) (2015) 2359–2372.

[17] X. Yuan, L. Qi, J. Shao, O. Chen, Some properties and applications of odd-colorable $r$-hypergraphs, arXiv:1606.05045v4, 2016.

[18] Y. Yang, Q. Yang, On some properties of nonegative weakly irreducible tensors, arXiv: 1111.0713v2, 2011.

[19] A. Yu, M. Lu, F. Tian, On the spectral radius of graphs, Linear Algebra Appl. 387 (2004) 41–49.